

Memo from:

ERNEST J. MONTGOMERY, M. D.

November 27, 1972

Dear Mr. Coken,

In telephone conversation with
Mr. William R.T. Smith I am writing
to request your Price list & to mention
that I have an 1807 Half Cent with
both of the "die breaks" as mentioned
in your book but not seen by you.
I would be glad to send it for you
to see if you are interested in seeing it.

Ernest J. Montgomery
1200 Broadway Blvd
Natrona Heights
Pa. 15065



Vibramycin[®] I.V. doxycycline hydiate for injection

16 Dec 72

Dear Mr. Loken,

Your hasty reply was most welcome. December is such a busy month that I will procrastinate sending you the 1807 Half Cent which I mentioned to you previously. As I am scheduled to present an exhibit and talk on Half Cents to our local coin club on 11 Jan 73 I shall then be able to devote more time to my numismatic interests & your price list.

Respects,

Ernest J. Montgomery
1200 Broadview Blvd.
Nature's Heights
Pa. 15205



LABORATORIES DIVISION

Pfizer Inc. New York N.Y. 10017

1/19/79

Ernest J. Montgomery
327 East Sexta ave
Tarentum PA. 15084

Dear Dr. Montgomery,

Can't see you it only took a short
while in place. One of these days - Not till
after April 15th - I would enjoy having a
Snow - Tell session on Half Creek. Well
you I had been thinking to write you
as I will be home late the you forwarded
the 1800 #1 last summer from him. The collector
wanted to compliment you on your "Proof"
article. Not so much for the content - but
for your refusal to be censored.

Perhaps - was to have in my book
in regard to the Proof. John W. Geiger says
"I relegated them to 2nd class citizenship" later
my intent when I release I would like to
expand the section on perhaps have in separate
book market.

I have enclosed the plate of the stone
from Homestead that needs examination before
you do. Please note it.

Let me start with the Proofs you kindly released
from Republics
that I could have shown up here if I had in my book.

18367
A = Pale Olive 161840 - 49 & 15°. Melt. & R were measured

(2 .

which being question also constitutes a 1/2 look like
the 1840 - 41 + 42 home or large cent design introduced
until 1843? The Reeded edges on 1840 + 1841 may be
part of the answer but perhaps after 1793 the design
of the half cent was copied from the large cent the
obverse
Half cent which I have on page 23 of my book does
not appear on the 1840 but appears on all other dates
which sort of ^{makes} it evident the 1840 was hubbed
first cutting in the obverse but this is the
exception of Proof only date of 1857 when the
Half cent were discontinued 1836, 1840, 1841, 1842, 1843
1844, 1845, 1846, 1847, 1848, 1849 (Burrill) + 1852 the
reverse is the quarter now 2 planchons then repeating
my self.

Working with this ^{Premise} it is evident when
Date collecting got its big boost upon the discontinuance
of the large + half cent in ¹⁸⁵⁷ ~~the~~ ^{some} employes at the
Mint decided to keep collectors demand for certain
Half cent Date which were impossible to find in
circulation but existed. Thus the Notice from
the Mint Gillett states that the mint is discontinued
1858 and he will send one a year, but I know
of, that the large cents reverse, which originals
and the small cents were restrikes of the
reverse in the "Cone Collector form". Each in
the 1880's did not address himself to the

Conclusions, The author, Walter Borden,
the author to point out that the Samuel Borden
Mills were different & don't know who built
the present. The author was told by someone
in Borden some where, that he had it in 1955
from Walter Borden he gave me a list of the last Mills
up at Half-Cent Valley. The first public at record
seen to have been in "Empire Zinc" probably
built in the late 1950's. All of this is apparent
in the Empire Half-Cent book in 1963.

Now coming Data Sheet First I think all
the Roger B. Borden I & the 1836 with exception
was built at the next station listed it above is the
Half-Cent Station Note that 1831 was also produced
it has been known about 1831 was the date and
the 1831 otherwise was known the other present. The author, the
original 1831 had been meeting to make 1832 Circulate
Ours and had probably been used up at that time. You might
also note that Gilchrist states that the date is a promotional
date which is in error as far as I can see. as far as
Walter Borden wants to point out that both
Brooks & Cornish Mills were built on the original
date.

Now as to the "1849" steples there actually there
are 4 different ones. Borden is only one of the 4
the others: the Cornish Mills, up in the 1849

No idea how many actual ones were made.
However all 4 slits seem to be made from
the same Hub. There are differences in shape the
exception 1854 with the ~~slotted~~ slot on the T of
~~the~~ United. If have never seen the 1850 in
what I consider to be a different one. I have noted that
both the Porcupine and Ceromata strokes of 1855 show
a line as follows
5555555555
/ AMER

This does not appear on any other date. and when you
know what a book fair you can find it in 1855
What all the books down to it slot for previous 5
there is a lot of looking to do. If you will note that
it slanted this is my book but plan to publish it in
the revision

Review 2, the CARRIAGE review of the New Model
from the Hub as often had 10 as the "series" required
it does not show it is an Original design.

Now to my conclusions at the bottom of the page
Please excuse and let me know what you think

Dr.

Briggs

412-226-0225

APPROVED 9/1/81
 1216 MINN 15065 PA
 NATRONA HEIGHTS PA
 15065

January 4 1981

Dear Sirs,
 Your Note of the 14th as I have had to get
 it. It was particularly gratifying to find that you were aware
 of a certain impression that you may have. The 15th 1980
 letter stated to you of your decision to take a
 right category different light in your research will be
 that welcome.

Your choice of the 1849 date in referring to the research
 paper is to be congratulated. I have always liked the reference
 to this date in the Red Book, and have been well by
 told that may have been able to effect a change only in
 reference to the 1831.

Reference to 1849 was soon

(a) small and large lots observed

(b) small and large lots observed for
 1849 AD, most of the time the small, the
 large lots not the same

(3) Your table shows the date of 1849 with your
 1845 type houses, small

I also find that the use of the Original Red
 Books, particularly with notes, that no
 consideration of chronology is extended on a
 place to a greater degree of early houses
 small houses, small lots, small town, well
 built houses etc. The distinction of prop/

PROOF-ONLY HALF CENTS

Ernest J. Montgomery, M.D.

There is a story about a king who desired not to be a king in order that he might have more time for pleasurable pursuits (numismatic endeavors?). Since each of his descendants was desirous of ascending the throne, he proposed The Royal Question: "Why?". The answers varied, but the ultimate winner was "Why not?". Therein lies the explanation of my interest in U.S. half cents, more specifically in those half cents which I shall discuss on this occasion.

The available information regarding the half cents of 1831, 1836, 1840-49, and 1852 is as scarce as the pieces themselves. There is a lack of effort in the assimilation, explanation, and scrutinization of what information is to be found. My effort is amateurish, but it will need no apology if it serves to stimulate a professional numismatist to do further research.

For my own collection, I had acquired over 60 of the 96 varieties of regular issue half cents as described by Roger Cohen; but I was finding it difficult to add others. While I kept looking for those yet to be acquired, my mind continued to drift toward those pieces Made in Proof Only - why they were made, when they were made, how they were made, how many were made, etc. I began searching through standard reference books, specialized half cent literature, and old and recent auction catalogues. The information which I gathered was sparse, occasionally repetitious, frequently isolated, and often-times unexplained. Here it is as I have gathered it:

With a governmental appropriation of \$1,000. in March, 1839, Congress began the development of a national coin collection. The U.S. Mint had been in business for almost 50 years at the time, so Congress soon found that it was dependent on acquiring specimens from those who had preserved them. Collectors, then as now, were not eager to yield their prize possessions easily, and the mint was in dire need of strong levers. The striking of proof coins was one such lever.

Walter Breen, in the COIN COLLECTOR'S JOURNAL of 1953, relates that proofs as issued individually can be traced back to 1817. Thus, serious collectors and the mint were already aware of each other. Since I found no evidence to the contrary, I presume that these proofs were from dies made during the dated year. Breen further lists 1834 as the first year in which proof coins appeared in sets. Mr. Breen justifies his details on the basis of a letter in the National Archives, dated November 11, 1834, from Secretary of State John Forsythe to Samuel Moore, Director of the Mint, requesting two complete sets of U.S. coins for presentation to the King of Siam and the Sultan of Muscatine. (This is the same letter which dates the 1804 dollar.) However, Don Taxay in Scott's 1976 CATALOGUE AND ENCYCLOPEDIA OF U.S. COINS describes certain coins of 1793 and 1794 as struck on specially-chosen planchets and he considers these as proofs. Taxay relates that the mint was preparing proof sets by the 1820's.

Prior to 1850, only half cents and cents are found as proofs in ~~no~~ greater quantities than about a dozen pieces each. Until 1858, proof coins could be

obtained at face value. After 1858, they were sold in sets at a small premium; but it was not until 1878 that mintage records of proofs for minor coins were kept.

Complete sets of proof coins containing half cents are known for the years 1840-1848. However, they are excessively rare. Since these proof sets of the 1840's contain half cents having large berries in the wreath of the reverse, they are evidence that those half cents with large berries on the reverse during the 1840-1848 period are originals. Restrikes of these originals, where the wire rims are less pronounced, are particularly known for 1840, 1843, 1847, and 1848, according to Taxay.

Q. David Bowers, in 1972, wrote in COIN WORLD that three varieties of the proof-only half cents of 1840 through 1848 are known. He described these as (1) originals, with large berries in the wreath on the reverse; (2) first restrikes, with the NT of CENT and the bow being recut and with very small berries in the wreath; and (3) second restrikes, with diagonal striations over RICA of AMERICA and also with small berries in the wreath.

An 1844 proof set of half cent to \$20. gold piece, owned by Dr. J. Hewitt Judd, has an accompanying invoice showing that it was originally purchased at face value. More recently, in THE NUMISMATIST for May, 1977, Paramount International advertised an original 1846 proof set consisting of 7 pieces, with the half cent having a large berry reverse; and they estimated that about two dozen such sets had been minted. Although each of these sets had a half cent with large berries on the reverse, a reverse with small berries had already appeared in 1839 on large cents.

In 1849, half cents were again struck for circulation, their production having been suspended in 1835. These circulation pieces are found to have a large date on the obverse, and small berries in the wreath on the reverse. Proofs of these large date 1849's with the small berry reverse are also known. In addition, proofs of 1849 with a small date on the obverse and all three varieties on the reverse were struck, but none were made for circulation. Those large date 1849 half cents with a small berry reverse which were made for circulation correspond to the other half cents of the 1850-1957 era. Since the existence of an 1849 small date half cent with a large berry reverse was not recognized until 1871 by Dr. Edward Maris, it very likely represents a re-strike. Thus, since the regular issue large date 1849 half cents with small berry reverse proofs are originals, I am inclined to view the 1849 small date with the same small berry reverse as original for that obverse.

In considering the 1852 proof-only half cents, it is noted that the 1852 proofs with the large berry reverse are exceedingly rare. Since it is improbable that the mint, after using a small berry reverse for the circulation strikes of 1849, 1850, and 1851 would then use a large berry reverse to strike the proof-only 1852 half cents and then return to using the small berry reverse for the regular issue strikes of 1853 through 1857, I contend that the proof-only 1852 half cents with the small berry reverse are the originals for that date. I humbly make this contention although it is contrary to Stack's opinion as expressed in its 1963 Fixed Price List of the Brobst collection. This particular collection contained one of the three known specimens of an 1852 half cent proof with a large berry reverse.

Is it possible that the small date 1849 proof-only half cent with the large berry reverse and the 1852 proof-only half cent with the large berry reverse were both struck at the same time?

Much has been said of the large and small berry reverses of the half cents in the proof-only group. Certainly it is convenient to use them in the recall of known varieties, but the use of these to account for the order of striking is to be challenged.

Let us now briefly consider the obverses of the proof-only half cents. The proof examples of 1825, 1826, 1828, 1829, 1833, and 1834 half cents and the large date half cents 1849-1857 all have large dates on the obverse. Only in 1849 do the half cents appear with both large and small dates, although both large and small date varieties began on the large cents in 1840. The 1831, 1836, and 1840-1846 half cents have small date obverses, while the 1847, 1848, and the 1852 proof-only half cents have large date obverses.

Interestingly, the only year of half cents struck for circulation with a small date on the obverse is the 1832. More interestingly, there is no record of any half cents being delivered by the mint during 1832. It has been presumed that the 1832 half cents were delivered during 1833. Is it possible that the 1832 half cents with the small date obverse were struck, or at least the die made, at the same time as the small date obverses of 1831, 1836, 1840-46, and the small date 1849's? The abundance of 1832's seen today makes it seem that it would have been a simple matter to have used a small number of planchets to strike those of the other dates without having to account for them.

Relative to the large date 1847 and 1848 obverses, this leads me to suspect that the mint prepared dies to resume regular issue strikes in 1847 but waited until 1849 before doing so. Since large and small date proofs of 1849 half cents are known, then I am also led to think that these large date proofs of 1847, 1848, and 1849 were all struck in 1849. Correspondingly, the small date 1849 proof half cents were struck at another time, along with the small date proof-only half cents.

Now let us look again at the half cent reverses. The large berry reverse made its final appearance in regular issue strikes during 1835, whereas the small berry reverse did not make its initial appearance until the regular issue strikes of 1849. Since, during this interval, there are recorded orders for proof sets, with actual delivery, and since these sets are found to contain half cents with the large berry reverse, it is these half cents which are most often called originals for these specific years, i.e. prior to the appearance of the small berry reverse in 1849. Therefore, the proofs of these same years, with the small berry reverses, were restrikes!

Nevertheless, since the small berry reverse did appear on the large cent in 1839, it is conceivable that the small berry reverse could have been used in the same (or the following) year for the half cent reverse. However, it is much more likely that a new reverse would have been prepared for striking a large number of pieces intended for circulation rather than for just a few pieces to be used as proofs. Thus, since the circulation pieces of 1849 with the small berry reverse were the first to be struck in a large quantity, then the small berry re-strike proofs were presumably made after 1849 and are truly restrikes.

Because the Act of 1873 required the destruction of all dies annually, then these restrikes were most likely struck sometime between 1849 and 1873.

S. H. Chapman, in his 1924 catalogue of the F. R. Alvord collection, refers to the "second restrikes of about 1875-1880", but gives no explanation for this estimated dating. Ebenezer Gilbert, in 1916, referred to "restrikes made in 1858" as having a small berry reverse and states that only 18 copies of each year were made. Again, there is no explanation for the estimated date. Gilbert made no mention of first and second restrikes, and it is difficult to believe that he would not have taken notice of the separate small berry reverses as later described by Q. David Bowers. Likewise, Ed Frossard made no distinction of these small berry reverses. In a personal communication from Mr. Bowers, he informed me that his knowledge of the separate small berry reverses originated with Wayte Raymond, published of the STANDARD CATALOGUE OF U.S. COINS. To whom, then, should credit be given for the original discovery of the separate small berry reverses on the proof-only half cents?

This recognition of two subvarieties of the small berry reverse leads to speculation. Such subvarieties exist for each of the 1831, 1836, 1840-49, and 1852 proof-only half cents. The recut letters of HALF CENT and the recutting of the bow are absent from those pieces having diagonal file marks over RICA, and vice versa. Commonly, the former are called first restrikes, while the latter are called second restrikes. This suggests a chronological order.

Additional descriptions refer to these as restrikes with the reverse of 1856 (recut) and those restrikes with the reverse of 1840 (file marks). Referring to those pieces as having the reverse of 1840 seems appropriate only in that this is the earliest date found with the recut letters on the reverse. More perplexing is the reference made to the reverses with the file marks as being the reverse of 1856, since the regular issue strikes of 1856 do not show the file marks. Moreover, the copper-nickel patterns of 1854 and 1856 have the same reverse without either recutting or file marks.

Mr. Breen relates the notation made by J.N.T. Levick in the 1866 Woodward catalogue of the F. S. Hoffman collection regarding an 1831 half cent with the large berry reverse varying from the large berry original of that year by the position of the high leaf on the reverse. He adds that these were struck in the mint in 1860 in large quantities. Whether or not the latter date is accurate, this does not prove that 1860 half cent restrikes had been made as early as 1860. Not to be ignored is that this restrike was of the large berry reverse. Was it made at the same time as the large berry restrikes of the originals of 1840, 1843, 1845, 1847, and 1848 with the high wire rims referred to previously? Actually, this reverse is that of 1836 G-1 and muled with the original 1831 obverse. Thus it had to be struck after 1836 since it is a later die state than that seen on the 1836 obverse. Mr. Breen also relates that the earliest reports of an 1831 half cent with small berry reverse date back to the 1880's and that proof half cents with the two reverses were known before 1865.

Although there is a tendency to view the proof-only half cents as consisting of (1) originals struck in the year of issue; (2) first restrikes struck at a later time; and (3) second restrikes all struck at an even later time, this grouping

is rather unlikely. Rather, I would tend to group them as follows:

1. The 1840 and 1841 half cent proofs were struck together, since they are the only ones to have ground-down reeded edges.

2. The 1831 and 1836 had at least one common striking, since they share a common reverse.

3. The 1847 and 1848 belong with the large date 1849-1857, including the 1852, since these half cents have large date obverses.

4. The large berry reverse 1852 is a restrike and the small berry 1852 is the original for that mintage year, since the small berry reverse had been in use on the regular issue strikes for the three previous years and the 1852 with the large berry reverse is exceedingly rare.

5. The time of origin of any of the restrikes remains to be determined, just as the origin of two separate small berry reverses remains unknown.

* * * * *

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

AMERICAN HALF CENTS Roger S. Cohen, Jr. 1971

MONOGRAPH OF U.S. CENTS AND HALF CENTS Ed. Frossard 1878

UNITED STATES HALF CENTS Q. David Bowers and James F. Ruddy 1962

THE UNITED STATES HALF CENTS Ebenezer Gilbert 1916

Sale of the F. R. Alvord half cent collection S. H. Chapman 1924

The Anderson Dupont collection Stack's 1954

Fixed Price List No. 69 United States Half Cents Collection of
Mr. Joseph Brobstein Stack's 1963

COIN COLLECTORS JOURNAL March, April, May, June 1953 "Proof
Coins Struck by the United States Mint - 1817-1921" Walter Breen

THE NUMISMATIST February, 1895 "Restrikes of United States Half
Cents" George W. Rice

Auction of March 15, 1975 by Stack's

Scott's COMPREHENSIVE CATALOGUE AND ENCYCLOPEDIA OF
U.S. COINS 1971 by Don Taxay

THE NUMISMATIST May, 1977 p. 988

Personal communications with Richard Picker, Q. David Bowers, et al

PROOF-ONLY HALF CENTS, PART II

Ernest J. Montgomery, M.D.

To discuss the rarity of the proof-only half cents is difficult. Since none exists in a quantity greater than a hundred, the R1-R10 system is inapplicable. The older descriptive reference of "scarce and rare" is likewise unsuitable. Furthermore, it is more to my interest to study their availability; and this might, or might not, be related to the number in existence. For an excellent listing of those known and often with the pedigree given, one is advised to search in the recent masterpiece, *A COINER'S CAVIAR*, by Walter Breen. The availability of the pieces which I have found at coin shows, in private collections, and in auctions and fixed price lists will be given in this article, during a discussion of individual mintage years based mainly on observations during the past decade.

On occasion, I have heard "hole fillers" referred to in a derisive manner; and I have wondered how many have shared with me a little private cringing. This is the first opportunity I have taken to admit to being a "hole filler". Certainly, I have always found my curiosity stirred, my appetite whetted, and intellectual pursuit begun in earnest, after acquisition. It was the filling of the last hole in the half cent series, the 1831, that initiated me into the proof-only half cents. Although circulation strikes of 1831 half cents were made, there is ample justification for discussion of 1831 half cents in conjunction with the proof-only half cents of 1836, 1840-49, and 1852.

In my previous article, I defined, for convenience sake, what has been accepted as Originals, First Restrikes, and Second Restrikes of the proof-only half cents. To reiterate briefly: The Originals have large berries on the reverse; the First Restrikes have small berries with letter and bow redoubling on the reverse; and the Second Restrikes have small berries with diagonal file marks over RICA on the reverse. However, study of the proof-only half cent 1831's quickly reveals that they do not comply with these criteria.

All of the 1831 pieces, including the circulation strikes, have a common obverse; and thus, division into Originals, First Restrikes, and Second Restrikes remains with the reverse.

The Originals of the 1831 are identified by finding that the uppermost leaf point is under the right side of the first S in STATES. Interestingly, it has large berries as do the Originals of 1840-49; but rather, it is the same reverse found on the 1832 circulation strikes C-1.

The First Restrikes of 1831 (which were distinguished from the Originals as early as 1860) are identified by the uppermost leaf point being beneath the left side of the first S in STATES. Unlike the First Restrikes of 1840-49, these 1831 pieces have large, rather than small, berries. They share this reverse with only the Original and First Restrike 1836 proof-only half cents. This reverse was incorrectly referred to as the "reverse of 1856" in Stack's 1976 ANA Auction Catalogue. Actually, since certain of these 1831 First Restrike pieces show the reverse with die states later than those found on any 1836 pieces, it is commonly referred to as "reverse of 1836" (see RED BOOK). Why this die developed cracks after apparently only a few strikings, however,

is difficult to understand. The possibility of a time delay between these few strikings is only partially satisfying.

Finally, the Second Restrikes of 1831 do share the reverse common to all of the proof-only half cent Second Restrikes. The Second Restrikes of 1831 do have small berries and they also have the diagonal file marks over RICA of AMERICA.

In viewing the availability of the 1831 proof-only half cents, I have found that, as a single year, they are the least available of all. No 1831 Second Restrike has been available, to the best of my knowledge, since the Stack's Fixed Price List of the Brobst collection in 1953. The Originals of 1831 are the rarest of all the proof-only half cent Originals except 1852, and the First Restrikes are near the median for proof-only half cent First Restrikes.

Continuing to the proof-only half cents of 1836, their categorization into Originals, First Restrikes, and Second Restrikes challenges the Imagination.

In fact, digression is necessary to help maintain one's equilibrum. A restrike is viewed as a coin made by official dies, either one or both of which were used to strike originals, but struck in a year other than the date on the coin. Relative to the proof-only half cents, those designated as Originals are so-called because they are from dies which are identical to those used to strike half cents included in Proof sets for the dated year. I have found no mention of Proof sets for either 1831 or 1836, such as the previously mentioned 1846 Proof set advertised by Paramount International (see my first article). The obverse on all proof-only half cents of any given year, both Originals and Restrikes, is the same. When the reverses have major die changes, then differentiating between Originals and Restrikes is obvious. However, when these changes are subtle, or do not occur at all, then the task becomes formidable. Identification by means of quality of striking, planchet variation, die progression, and such, has been made by many. In such cases, one is faced with the fact that the quality of striking ordinarily varies, that die progression occurs at a non-uniform rate, and that planchets from the same strip of metal commonly appear different. Furthermore, a die which is common to more than one dated year might mean that the die itself was used in each year; and thus, of itself, does not suggest a restrike is difficult to adhere to, then its use as a "handle" such as in the proof-only half cents becomes acceptable if not totally justifiable.

Let us turn now to the proof-only half cents of 1836, the last year for the use of the Classic Head obverse, to see an example of the subtleties being used for differentiation. As will be seen, it is not practical to discuss 1836 Originals apart from the First Restrikes. In the Brobst collection sold by Stack's, the 1836 Original was reported to have no bulging, to have slightly rounded edges, and to weigh 84% grains. The First Restrikes did have bulging, a square wire edge, and weighed 77 3/4 grains. Each of these has large berries on the reverse. Walter Breen used these same characteristics for distinguishing them, giving weights of 84 grains for the Original, and 81.8 grains for the First Restrikes, with allowances. A specimen which I recently examined from a private collection revealed doubling of HALF CENT, although I have not seen this mentioned previously in any description. As

copper patterns. If reeded edge planchets were truly struck in plain collars, such that the reeding were to become extremely shallow, then it seems to me that these pieces would have extremely high wire edges. Such is not the case. Interestingly, there is a rough corollary if one gives thought to the 1804 Great Britain bank dollar. All of these pieces were struck on Spanish pieces with the undertype being very clear on many of them. However, all examples of the 1804 Great Britain bank dollar which I have seen have a plain edge while the original Spanish dollar planchets do not! ?! ?!

Finally, despite the obverse die for all 1840-49 proof-only half cents being considered common to all dates, the existence of die cracks on 1841 pieces refutes this. Die cracks of the 1831 Restrikes were mentioned previously, but I have found no mention of other specific die breaks among the other proof-only half cents.

In general, the Originals and Second Restrikes of 1840-49 are of equal availability, and the First Restrikes are about two-thirds of this availability. In comparing the appearance of the Originals, there is no real difference. The 1841 Originals have been somewhat more plentiful, but this seems to be due to the re-appearance of lesser desired pieces which have seen circulation. The small date 1849 Original with large berries has been available to an extent far greater than the estimated mintage would suggest. The First Restrikes of 1848 and small date 1849 have been far more available than the others, whereas the 1840, 1845, and 1847 seldom have been seen during the past decade.

In considering the Second Restrikes of 1840-49, it is the 1841, 1846, and 1847 which have been the most readily available. I have not found any record of an 1849 small date Second Restrike proof-only half cent. A Bowers & Ruddy listing refers to one being reported, but they had not seen it.

Having thus discussed the 1831, 1836, and 1840-49 proof-only half cents, the only ones remaining to be discussed are those of 1852. These pieces are a topic in and of themselves. They were alluded to in my first article. The First Restrikes of 1852 proof-only half cents stands out as the overwhelmingly most available example of a proof-only half cent. Thus, it is the best opportunity for the type collector. A Second Restrike of 1852 has been unavailable to my knowledge, except for the piece in Kagin's 1977 ANA catalogue. There was none in the Dupont, Alvord, Ryder, or Brobst collections.

Although this completes the discussion on the half cents which comprise the proof-only half cent series, there are additional pieces of which to be aware. Since the reverse of the First Restrike pieces with letter and bow redoubling are often referred to as Reverse of 1856, and since neither the circulation nor pattern pieces of 1856 show this reverse, then one should be aware of certain 1856 and 1857 half cent proofs with this reverse. This was explained to me by Walter Breen. In the descriptions of 1856 and 1857 proof half cents, rarely is any special mention made of the reverse. Thus, cherrypicking of the less common reverse with redoubling is a real possibility.

This then completes a two part general discussion of the proof-only half cents. I confess again, as I did in the beginning, that it is amateurish and I desire that an assimilation of corrections, criticisms, and supplementation will be forthcoming from the EAC members to the benefit of all half cent collectors.

To summarize this second part:

1. The 1831 and 1836 proof-only half cents have a loose relationship with those of 1840-49 and 1852 through the Second Restrike.
2. The use of the terms Original and Restrike relative to the proof-only half cents is imprecise but intended for convenience.
3. Availability varies within the group:
 - a. The existence of any 1840 small date Second Restrike proof half cents is extremely unlikely.
 - b. The Second Restrikes of 1831 and 1836 rarely become available, as do the large berry and Second Restrike 1852's.

* * * * *

Editor's note: Dr. Montgomery included an extensive bibliography with the above article. Because of space limitations in P-W, it is not reprinted here. If anyone should wish a copy, the Editor will be happy to forward him one.

* * * * *

RAY WILLIAMSON SUFFERS FREAK AUTO ACCIDENT

The Editor has just learned from well-known EACer Raymond Williamson of Lynchburg, Virginia that he and Mrs. Williamson, and a friend riding with them, had a serious auto accident on November 10, 1977 on U.S. Route 60 near Powhatan, Virginia. Ray, who was driving, came upon at 8 P.M. at night an unlighted, stalled pickup truck which was blocking his lane of the two-lane highway. In his effort to avoid crashing into the truck, Williamson applied his brakes, causing his car to swerve off the road, down an embankment, and into a tree. The car was totally destroyed, but seat belts saved the passengers' lives. A State Trooper, after completing his investigation, termed the incident a 'freak' accident.

Ray received a compressed fracture of a vertebra and a cut lip. Mrs. Williamson had a broken arm and also a back injury. Their passenger received a fractured tibia and a broken jaw. The Williamsons remained confined to a Richmond hospital for two weeks, but they are home now and recuperating slowly from their ordeal.

I am sure that I express the wish of all EACers that both Ray and Mrs. Williamson make a quick and complete recovery.

* * * * *

ERNEST J. MONTGOMERY, M. D.
1216 MINNESOTA AVE.
NATRONA HEIGHTS, PENNSYLVANIA 15065

TELEPHONE 412 - 226-1119

11 October 84

Dear Roger —

Thank you for the opportunity to receive your forthcoming ANS presentation. I remain fascinated by your approach & have no difficulty with it.

Relative to the prices which they bring, I am convinced there reflect more on past price history of the individual piece than on relative scarcity. Following the Garrett sale I feared that all such pieces would forever be escalated beyond what the current generation would judge on their worth. Fortunately those that have appeared since have sold for about $\frac{1}{3}$ of the Garrett price.

The appearance of the 1852 large berry in the Doyle sale was exciting as I fully

ERNEST J. MONTGOMERY, M. D.
1216 MINNESOTA AVE.
NATRONA HEIGHTS, PENNSYLVANIA 15065

TELEPHONE 412 - 226-1119

expected that it would only appear in a
collection of the Half cent Proofs that
would be very near to or totally complete.

Kind regards to you and your wife
and bump.

cordially,

Ernie

July 16, 1988

Dear Roger,

I have been desirois since our recent telephone conversation of being able to send to you a transcript of my investigation of the 1811 Restrike. However, it is becoming increasingly clear that I shall not accomplish this before the last minute before the EAC ^{there} meeting of the PNA convention at 1 pm on August 13. Even though it will be inappropriate to call it complete because it will be that that is where I stopped. Thus, I am writing to you at this time asking for your help in the following:

- 1) Do you have pictures of the 1802 Reverse B early and late die states as shown in your book?
- 2) When did you become aware that there were more than six specimens?
- 3) Do you agree with the egomaniac's pedigree listing?
- 4) Are you free to tell me who else has one of these pieces? Mine is the R.L. Miles specimen.
- 5) Have you ever seen more than one example at the same setting?
- 6) Please tell me anything else that you care to share from the recesses of your mind.

I trust that this will find you in better health and able to attend the PAN show. Perhaps you will be my guest at dinner?

I can imagine that you are up to your apical pate with Want Lists but I cannot refrain:

1793 C₂ - I prefer a G to VG example as it amazes me how close in appearance my other 3 varieties are
1794 C_{1a}, C_{6a}, 7, 8
1797 C_{3c}
1805 C₂
1806 C₃
1808 C₁
1809 C₁

Photos
82-83
To Be
Released

MANY THANKS!

Cordially,

Eunie

7/21/88

Dear Ervna

Yours of 7/10 received and will try to answer.

- 1) Yes I have these photos and am sending them to you so that if you can use them on 8/13 you'll have them. Just mail back when you finish.
- 2) I became aware of more than 6 specimens probably in 1981 or 1983. If you will note on Page 124 of my second edition it states Six are known. This was written in the summer of 1981.
- 3)+4) The egomaniac's history needs some correction but is substantially correct. I will list and give numbers and show who owns to my knowledge.

①	is	Property	of	JON MANSON
②	✓	✓	✓	R. TETTENHORST AND IS PICTURED IN BOTH MY BOOK AND THE BIG RED BOOK THIS SPECIMEN HAS THE MOST ORIGINAL COLOR. YOU MIGHT NOTE I SAW IT AT THE CONN STATE LIBRARY WHICH IS PLANNING TO SELL THEIR COINS
③	✓	✓	✓	NO ONE - THIS COIN DID NOT SHOW UP IN NORWEG'S SALE - I BELIEVE SHITHEM CONFUSED THIS WITH THE LAUDER COIN LOT 274 THAT WAS SOLD IN 1983 AND WAS NOT LISTED BY HIM.
④	✓	✓	✓	DONALD GROVES PATRICK.. Note the Big Red Book doesn't give his last name.
⑤	✓	✓	✓	YOU NO further explanation needed.
⑥	✓	✓	✓	J.R. MCGOWAN who purchased it in June 1985
⑦	✓	✓	✓	IM NOT 100% SURE BUT I BELIEVE IT TO BE REV. HARRY STEWART. THIS PERSON IS REPORTED TO ME TO BE A
⑧	✓	✓	✓	

(2)

Major Half Cent Collector. However I have had
No Contact with him. This Person may be an
alias or a cover for some one who wishes to
remain anonymous. Eventually this will be
known but for now "Peter Horr, Stewart" will
do or if you prefer New Jersey Private Collector.
The Big Red Book uses the terms "PRIVATE COLLECTOR"
or "PRIVATE COLLECTION" when they don't know
who now has the coin.

Back to the List:

(9) is the property of. JOHN JAY PITTMAN
(10) - - - - I don't know who purchased
it at Bowers 1/83 Sale.
Do you know?

So the Lander Coin covered under (4) is the
only one missing to my knowledge. I don't know
who purchased it and have no idea where it is.

Thanks for your invitation to dinner at the
PNA Convention. I'm still on the No Travel schedule
as per my doctor so I can't be there. I'd sure like
to hear your talk on the 1811 but "DOCTORS ORDERS"
have gone over your want list and I have none
of them. The 1809 #1 is now down to R-3 with over
40 Specimens known. The same applies to 1805 #2. You should
be able to get these from ETC dealers. The 1793 & 1799 should
be no problem other than the cost. 1797 #2, 1806 #3 and 1808 #1
remain as very rare R-7 & High RT so it may be a while
before you get them.

It was good to hear from you

Bozen

ERNEST J. MONTGOMERY, M. D.
1216 MINNESOTA AVE.
NATRONA HEIGHTS, PENNSYLVANIA 15065
TELEPHONE 412 - 226-1119

27 July 88

Dear Roger -

Many thanks for allowing me to see the picture and the information. The following I have learned:

- ① Lot #274 of the Lunder sale by Wm Doyle was purchased at \$6500 by bidder #153, Jon Hansen; since he is presumed to own #1 per your letter, perhaps, he was agent for Partchik or Nagyjiga (?). Lot #402 #11
- ② Lot #473 from the Virgil Brand Paul / sale of Nov. 7, 1983 (somehow I'm missing that catalogue and have written to John Bergman to see if he has one) went to Anthony Ternanova at \$8500. Subse-
quently it showed up in a Robert L.
Heggen inventory. Whereabouts now
is a guess. As you say likely #10

ERNEST J. MONTGOMERY, M. D.
1216 MINNESOTA AVE.
NATRONA HEIGHTS, PENNSYLVANIA 15065
TELEPHONE 412 - 226-1119

③ Heritage Baltimore ANA Sale of 1985
lot #? (I'm also missing this catalogue)
was purchased by a Wallace Lee of Pontiac,
Mich.

I have written to Jon Hansen, Dan Parkers, JJ. Petersen,
Jim Mc Guigan, R. Tettenhout (this name makes
about as much sense as Donald Groves & P.) Rev.
Harry Stewart (?) also for Jimmy Swaggart; I don't
know R. Tettenhout's real name) and Wallace Lee
and am awaiting replies. Here's hoping!

I have reviewed, amended, deleted etc my
comments numerous times. How'd you ever
write your masterpiece and then return for
a (Second Edition); and maybe a Third?

At any rate I keep thinking of David Brinkley's
comment during the Democratic Convention:

"No politician has ever lost a single vote
by what he didn't say."

Cordially,

Ernie

ERNEST J. MONTGOMERY, M. D.
1216 MINNESOTA AVE.
NATRONA HEIGHTS, PENNSYLVANIA 15065
TELEPHONE 412 - 226-1119

24 August 88

Dear Roger,

Enclosed is a copy of the information that was used along with slides at the EAC Meeting during the PASN Convention of August 13. Since then, I have received descriptions and weights of two additional specimens and the Charter membership of the 1811 Portlock Half Cent Preservationists in (4). Again, many thanks for your help. I hope that you are feeling better.

Cordially,

Ernie

P.S. I had delightful conversation with Jules Keever at the meeting

THE 1811 RESTRIKE HALF CENT

I recognize in the audience those persons with whom I would have enjoyed discussing today's topic, viz.....I want to thank those persons represented on the Bibliography sheet but I especially want it known that Roger Cohen and Jim McGuigan have been most generous with their time and knowledge. Last but not least I want to express my gratitude to those members of the 1811 Restrike Half Cent Preservationists who responded to the letters I sent to them requesting information about their specimens, viz....*Wayne R. Lettichard, John J. Pillman*

I hope that you who are present will be patient in your listening and tolerant of my inaccuracies but feel free to make any comments at the close that you may desire. I have truly learned that the best way to appreciate a bridge builder is by building a bridge.

Finally, let me say to thse of you who do not know how I have come to be here ask Wayne Homren.

THE 1811 RESTRIKE HALF CENT

I. Introduction

It is widely accepted that a Restrike is a coin struck from authentic dies but produced in a year different from the year of regular issue. If it is, in addition, a combination of dies that were not used together for any regular issue then it is also a Mule. By using these definitions the 1811 Half Cent under consideration today is both a Restrike and a Mule. However, although to refer to it as an 1811 Restrike Mule Half Cent is accurate and precise I prefer to continue the traditional appellation of the 1811 Restrike Half Cent.

THE 1811 RESTRIKE HALF CENT

II. History

It has been promulgated that among other dies acquired by Joseph J. Mickley after the Mint fire of 1815 were an Obverse die originally used in 1811 for the striking of United States Half Cents and also a Reverse die used in 1802 for the striking of United States Half Cents. The 1811 Restrike Half Cent is a combination of these two dies.

It is Mickley who has been given credit for being the first in 1863 to offer a specimen for sale consisting of a Half Cent with an 1811 Obverse and an 1802 Reverse. Also, one appeared as lot #76 in the W. Eliot Woodward sale of October 18, 1864. Whether these represent the same or different specimens is not known. More recently, Breen gives the distinction of the initial offering as being lot #493 of Edward Cogan's auction of December 19, 1859.

THE 1811 RESTRIKE HALF CENT

III. Definition

As described in 1916 by Gilbert there are two varieties of the regular issue of the 1811 United States Half Cents consisting of two Obverse dies, commonly referred to as the wide date and the close date. These are each combined with a common Reverse die. The close date Obverse die subsequently used for the striking of the 1811 Restrike Half Cent was initially used to strike the Gilbert Variety 1. The Empire Guide lists the 1811 Half Cent with this Obverse die as E-63. (The Empire Guide is the only source that includes the 1811 Restrike Half Cent in an attribution of the United States Half Cent series assigning it as E-65.) Neither Gilbert nor the Empire Guide give any reasons for the order of their variety listings. However, Cohen and Breen do explain that their listings are on the basis of emission sequence. Cohen and Breen each list the close date Obverse as being the same die used for the Obverse of the regular issue of the 1811 Half Cents which they attribute as Variety 2. None of the four attributors mention any developing characteristics of this die relative to the die's usage.

Since the total census of the 1811 regular issue Half Cents is 63,140 and all were delivered to the Mint on July 11 then the only evidence of the relative usage of the wide and close date Obverse dies is the Rarity ratings that have evolved, i.e. R₄ for the wide date Cohen and Breen Variety 1 and R₃ for the close date Cohen and Breen Variety 2.

In reviewing the regular issue of 1802 Half Cents it is seen that there are two varieties consisting of a single Obverse die combined with separate old style and new style Reverse dies as first described by Gilbert. The old style Reverse is found on Gilbert's Variety 2 and is an R₆. The new style

THE 1811 RESTRIKE HALF CENT

Reverse die of the 1802 Half Cent initially used on Gilbert's Variety 1 is the same Reverse die used on the 1811 Restrike Half Cent. In this case the Empire Guide attributes it as E-27. Cohen and Breen refer to the new style 1802 Reverse die as Reverse B. It is to be remembered that this is the only Reverse die in the entire United States Half Cent series to have a berry between the right stem and the lower outside leaf.

Gilbert pointed out that, at times, slight die breaks from the ends of the stems could be seen to extend toward the U in UNITED and the final A in AMERICA. The Empire Guide relates that a progressively weaker HALF CENT develops with the use of the die. Cohen, in his first edition of American Half Cents the "Little Half Sisters", states that it is his opinion that the die breaks as reported by Gilbert are defects in the die preparation rather than true die breaks. In addition, in the second edition of his book he relates that a number of small line breaks develop between some of the letters of the legend when the die is in a rusted state and he further states that a specimen has been reported as having a rim break over RICA of AMERICA. Completing the reports of the four attributors relative to Reverse die changes, Breen describes the appearance of rust spots around the legend and fraction with subsequent appearance of a crack from the rim to the first T in STATES. These developments resulting from the use of the new style Reverse die of 1802 will be seen later under the Description of the Exhibited Coin.

The total census of 1802 Half Cents of regular issue is 14,366 with the second of two deliveries to the Mint being 6,166 pieces on September 1⁴. This second delivery is presumed to be the coins having been produced with the new style Reverse die that was subsequently used on the 1811 Restrike Half Cent

THE 1811 RESTRIKE HALF CENT

and this suggests that this was the extent of use of the die during 1802.. If the 6,166 figure is to represent the number of pieces of the Variety 2 then this leaves 8,200 out of the total for pieces of Variety 1. However, the relative ratings of R_6 for the old style Reverse Variety 1 and R_4 for the new style Variety 2 of the regular issues indicate otherwise.

THE 1811 RESTRIKE HALF CENT

IV. Enumeration

The first notation of the number of specimens of the 1811 Restrike Half Cent was by John Haseltine in his cataloguing of the 1880's. There he stated that there were (6) struck for Mickley. Interestingly, I found no given basis for this figure. Also, I did not find anywhere that Mickley himself said how, when, where, or how many specimens were struck and why Haseltine arrived at six is a matter few conjecture. Nevertheless, it has been repeated over and over by such as Bowers, Breen, Cohen, Ingalls, Paramount, Parke-Bernet, Scott, Spadone, Stack's, and Taxay.

The referral to specific coins appears to have begun with Stack's auction of the Dupont collection in 1954. Interestingly, the Dupont catalogue refers to the Brobst specimen subsequently sold in 1963, the Showers specimen subsequently sold in 1969, and the ^{Miles} ~~Miles~~ specimen subsequently also sold in 1969. All of these were negotiated by Stack's. Almost without exception, since the Dupont sale subsequent references have been made to those of the 1) Brobst, 2) Showers, 3) Dupont, and 4) Miles collections. A few of those referring to these specimens are: The Scott Catalogue and Encyclopedia US Coins, Collecting Rare Coins for Profit by Q. David Bowers, the Breen encyclopedias, the Brobst sale, the Hathaway and Bowers FPL's of 1969-1971, and the Spence sale by Stack's in 1975.

Whereas, in his Encyclopedia of US and Proof Coins 1722-1977 published in 1977 Breen lists (5) specimens, in his publication of Walter Breen's Encyclopedia of United States Half Cents 1793-1857 in 1983 he gives a Pedigree listing of (10) 1811 Restrike Half Cents. The specimen shown today is included in the listing and since I have personally traced it back to the R.L. Miles, Jr. col-

THE 1811 RESTRIKE HALF CENT

lection I have no doubts that its additional pedigree listing by Breen is accurate. However, in ~~only~~ one instance, viz. the specimen currently in the Connecticut State Library collection, does he trace the Pedigree before the beginning of the Twentieth century. This causes me to wonder how many early pieces have not been included.

The specimen in Breen's listing referred to as "Thomas Elder (circa 1941); Mrs. R. Henry Norweb collection" has not appeared in the sales pertaining to the Norweb collection. All other specimens in this listing have been traced to their current owners and except for the George J. Bauer specimen, which has remained in the same numismatist's collection since being acquired by private treaty, has changed owners relatively recently. Personally, I find the use of Pseudonyms by collectors puzzling unless such persons believe that the sale of an "unknown" will fetch a higher price than one of known pedigree. Perhaps, this same desire for anonymity (what is anonymity anyway?) is the reason that some of these same people are unable to interchange with other collectors about their possessions. Nevertheless, I shall withhold their names pending future endeavors to communicate with them. Unfortunately, I must confess that I have been unable to confirm the truth or denial of the locations as learned in some cases despite handwritten letters including SASE's.

Regarding certain others in the Breen Pedigree listin, it has been suggested to me that the specimen sold by William Doyle's auction of the Lauder collection on December 16, 1983 is the aforementioned Norweb specimen. Relative to the Brand specimen as sold in the Bowers and Merena Number 7, 1983 Part 1 sale of the Virgil M. Brand collection, it was purchased by one dealer and it has been seen for sale in the inventory of another dealer who has not responded.

THE 1811 RESTRIKE HALF CENT

to my correspondence. This specimen is known to have been purchased by Brand in 1905 at the first of what would be many sales by Thomas Elder as reported by Q. David Bowers on p. 109 of Virgil Brand-The Man and his Era (1983).

The Heritage ANA Auction of 1985 specimen was purchased by a Michigan collector who also prefers not to respond to my postal.

Among the specimens which have appeared in sources within my own library and not seen in the Breen listing are: 1) Woodward (J.E. Cooley, lot #761, Oct. 1864), 2) Leavitt, Strebeigh & Co. (Alfred S. Robinson, Oct. 22, 1867), 3) Mason & Co. (Fewsmith, lot #1087, Oct. 4, 1870), 4) Scott & Co., 1871-1874 Coin Priced catalogues, 5) Messrs. Bangs & Co. (John W. Haseltine, lot #470, Jan. 31, 1879), 6) S.H. & H. Chapman (Thomas Cleaneay, lot #1962, Dec. 9-13, 1890), 7) Lyman Low (Jas. S. Bryant, lot #91, Dec. 12, 1906), 8) Thomas Elder (George Ross, lot #1839, May 13-15, 1937), and 9) the Exhibition of US and Colonial Coins Jan.-Feb. 18, 1814 ¹⁹¹⁴ by the American Numismatic Society, "Half Cents loaned by George P. French, Rochester, N.Y.: 1811 Original, 1811 Restrike (Half Cents).

Just where these and other specimens were while attention was being given to the Brobston, Showers, Dupont, and Miles specimens is a mystery. Were they produced while the dies were owned by Mickley? Were they produced with or without Mickley's knowledge, or his direction, or his permission? One thing for certain, the dies were reacquired by the government prior to the auction of the Mickley estate by Moses Thomas & Sons in November of 1878 and then destroyed. Thus, any creations after 1878 are forgeries of restrikes.

I have been curious to note that the Reverse die is referred to in different ways in the early catalogues: Cleaneay (Rev. of 1808), Woodward (Rev. of 1807), Bryant (Rev. prior to 1809), Neil and Roach, both catalogued by Mehl (Rev. of 1807 and before), ~~and~~ the Monograph of Frossard (.....reverse belonging/

THE 1811 RESTRIKE HALF CENT

to ~~one~~^{one} of the years between 1802 and 1808), and Rice (Rev. of 1804). This is another matter for conjecture.

THE 1811 RESTRIKE HALF CENT

V. Description of the Exhibited Coin

There has been very little in the descriptions of the actual coins in the catalogue sales which is of help in separating one from the other. On no occasion have I found more than one specimen in the same location at the same time. Thus, a comparison of any two has not been made. Commonly, they have been described as Proof, from rusted dies, etc. The characteristics of the wear of the Reverse die as described by Gilbert, the Empire Guide, Cohen, and Breen have been ignored.

The specimen on exhibit has been described as follows: In the Allenberger collection sale of 1948 it is called "Proof, the Obverse is red and ~~blue~~ five. The Reverse is iridescent purple." In the R.L. Miles, Jr. catalogue it is called "Proof, struck from rusty dies, iridescent, magenta, and sea green." In the Hathaway and Bowers FPL's there is no description and in the Auction 80 catalogue of Stack's sale the description of the Mile's sale is repeated.

Current examination confirms the presence of both a magenta and sea green iridescence especially when viewed in sunlight. The Obverse reveals a prominent wire rim from the 7th star around the top of Liberty to the 10th star. From here there is a much thinner wire rim to a point opposite the second 1 of the date. Relative to the denticles, from midway between the 13th star and the second 1 of the date the denticles become round and resemble a beaded border continuing as such until opposite the point of the bust. The denticles are all clear but are especially clear beneath the area of the high wire rim. The rust spots are prominent at the second star, the ninth star, and the 8 and the second 1 of the date. Other rust spots are seen in the field.

On the Reverse, the rim shows a very small cud above the space between U and N of UNITED. There is a large cud on the second A in AMERICA to the right edge of the first cypher in the date. The denticles are flattened from the first

THE 1811 RESTRIKE HALF CENT

T in STATES to the final S in STATES. There are lines from the rim to each of the T's in STATES. There is a small line between the R and I of AMERICA at the rim. There are no lines extending from the stems toward either the U of UNITED nor the final A of AMERICA. Is the absence of such lines evidence that when present they do represent die breaks rather than defects in the preparation of the die since the latter would be present on all coins made ~~from~~ ^{of} the die?

As may be expected, there is no effort at giving the weight, diameter, circumference, or the thickness of any specimen offered for sale or auction other than the weight of three specimens in the Breen Pedigree listing.

The following measurements of the Exhibited coin were made on an Ohaus 3100 Dial-o-gram Balance and with a Craftsman 6" Dial Vernier Caliper.

The dry or air weight = 81.7 grains
The wet weight = 72.5 grains
The weight of water displaced = 9.2 grains
The Specific Gravity = 8.880

The Ohaus Specific Gravity for Half Cents of 1793-1857 is 8.96. Due to a probable chemical imbalance in some alloys a plus or minus 0.5 variation is an acceptable tolerance in a final reading. For this coin the minus).08 difference is of no significance and therefore, the Specific Gravity for this 1811 Restrike Half Cent is normal. According to Cowles Complete Encyclopedia of U.S. Coins by Mort Reed, Copyright 1969 the weight of U.S. Half Cents (1800-1808) is 80 grains and for U.S. Half Cents (1809-1836) it is 84 grains.

The diameter of this coin = 0.917" or 2.3 cm. and the thickness = 0.065" or 0.1625 cm.

From my own collection I have compiled the following comparisons:

THE 1811 RESTRIKE HALF CENT

1802 Half Cents

<u>Specimen #</u>	<u>Dry Weight</u>	<u>Wet Weight</u>	<u>Weight of Water Displaced</u>	<u>Specific Gravity</u>
1 (OR)	72.6 gr.	64.2 gr.	8.4 gr.	8.64
2 (NR)	79.9	70.7	9.2	8.55
3	80.5	71.4	9.1	8.85
RESTRIKE	81.7	72.5	9.2	8.80
4	73.0	64.9	8.1	9.01
5	78.8	70.1	8.7	9.05
6	83.0	73.9	9.1	9.12

* The official weight is 80 grains for 1800-1808 Half Cents and the Specific Gravity is 8.96.

1811 Half Cents

<u>Specimen #</u>	<u>Dry Weight</u>	<u>Wet Weight</u>	<u>Weight of Water Displaced</u>	<u>Specific Gravity</u>
1	79.9 gr.	70.6 gr.	9.3 gr.	8.59
2	81.9	72.5	9.4	8.71
3	79.6	70.4	9.2	8.73
4	78.2	69.3	8.9	8.79
RESTRIKE	81.7	72.5	9.2	8.80
5	82.7	73.4	9.3	8.89
6	80.1	71.4	8.7	9.21

* The official weight is 84 grains for 1809-1836 Half Cents and the Specific Gravity is 8.96.

THE 1811 RESTRIKE HALF CENT

VI. Description of Other Specimens of the 1811 Restrike Half Cents

The specimen now in a Missouri collection and which is the plate coin in both the Cohen and Breen books has a visible space between the second and third 1's of the date on the Obverse. This is not seen on the Exhibited coin. On the Reverse there is a prominence of the left rim especially from opposite the 2 of the denominator to opposite the U of UNITED and again opposite STAT of STATES. There is a small cud extending for five denticles ending at the top of the first A in AMERICA and there is a very large cud extending from opposite the final A in AMERICA to opposite the right side of the second cypher of the denominator. The small cud referred to is not present on the Exhibited specimen and the larger cud is smaller on the Exhibited coin. In addition, the cracks through the tops of RICA as seen on the Missouri coin are not seen on the Exhibited coin. These suggest that the Missouri coin is a later strike. The rust spots are identicle on the two specimens.

The Showers specimen is almost identicle to the Missouri specimen. No color comparisons can be made until the coins can be examined at the same time and this will take some doing.

THE 1811 RESTRIKE HALF CENT

August 13, 1988

Pennsylvania Association
of
Numismatists

VII. Bibliography

1. Auction 80, August 15, 1980; Stack's, lot #1014
2. Bowers, Q. David-Virgil Brand-The Man & his Era (1983)
3. Bowers, Q. David and Ruddy, James F.-The Empire Guide to United States Half Cents (1964)
4. Bowers, Q. David-United States Copper Coins (1984)
5. Bowers, Q. David-Collecting Rare Coins for Profit (1975)
6. Bowers & Merena Sale, November 7, 1983-Virgil Brand sale Part 1, lot #473
7. Breen, Walter-Encyclopedia of US & Colonial Proof Coins 1722-1977 (1977)
8. Breen, Walter-Encyclopedia of United States Half Cents (1983)
9. Breen, Walter-Complete Encyclopedia of U.S. & Colonial Coins (1988)
10. Chapman, S.H. & H., December 9-13, 1890-Thomas Cleaneay collection, lot #1962
11. Cohen, R.S., Jr.-American Half Cents (First Edition) (1971)
12. Cohen, R.S., Jr.-American Half Cents (Second Edition) (1982)
13. Cooley, J.E.-Catalogue of American Coins, Medals, etc. form the Cabinets of Mssrs. J.N.T. Levick, J. Osborn Emery, F.I. Isley, and L.H. Abbey, all of which have recently been purchased by the present owner, W. Eliot Woodward..... to be sold at auction by J.E. Cooley, (Geo. A. Leavitt, Auctioneer), October 18-22, 1864, lot #761
14. Doyle, William, Galleries, December 16, 1983-Loye L. Lauder collection, lot #274
15. Elder, Thomas, May 1937-Dr. George Ross collection, lot #1839
16. Elder, Thomas, September 1-3, 1910-Peter Mougey collection, lot #307
17. Frossard, Edward-Monograph of US Cents and Half Cents (1879)
18. Gilbert, Ebenezer-The United States Half Cents (1916)
19. Hathaway & Bowers-Volume III Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, (1970-1971), FPL's
20. Heritage 1985 ANA Auction
21. Lindheim, Leon-Facts & Fiction (1967)
22. Low, Lyman, December 12, 1906-James S. Bryant collection, lot #91
23. Mason & Co., October 4, 1870-Fewsmith Cabinet, lot #1087
24. Mehl, Max, June 3, 1941-W.F. Dunham collection, lot #1269
25. Mehl, Max, February 8, 1944-Belden Roach collection, lot #3278
26. Mehl, Max, June 17, 1947-W.W. Neil collection, lot #2250
27. Mehl, Max, March 23, 1948-Dr. Christian A. Allenberger collection, lot #658
28. New Netherlands, Fourty Fourth Catalogue, June 23, 1954-Hillyer-Ryder collection
29. Numismatic Scrapbook Magazine, January 20, 1949-"Browsing Through Old Coin Auction Catalogues", Phil Ingalls
30. Numismatic Scrapbook Magazine, July 1975, "What Would you Call.....", Tom DeLorey
31. Numismatic Scrapbook Magazine, April 1949, "Restrike of the 1811 Half Cent", J.J. Pitt
32. Paramount, April 30, May 1, 1965-The Century Sale, lot #89
33. Farke-Bernet Galleries Inc. (NY), September 24-25, 1969-Fred Canfield collection, lot #
34. Penny Wise: Volume III No. 1 pp. 44-45, Paul Carter
IV No. 5 p. 165, Jeffrey & Paul Oliphant
XII No. 1 p. 30, Mark Borckardt
XIII No. 6 p. 224 Richard Bilancia
35. Raymond, Wayte-Standard Catalogue of US Coins (1953)

THE 1811 RESTRIKE HALF CENT

36. Numismatist, Volume XXIX September 1916, George R. Ross
37. Rose, Joseph & Hazelcorn, Howard-The Comprehensive Catalogue and Encyclopedia of United States Coins (second edition) 1976
38. Spadone, Frank J.-Major Variety & Oddity Guide of US Coins (1967)
39. Stack's, November 11-13, 1954-Anderson Dupont Catalogue Part II, lot #1107
40. Stack's, FPL No. 69, January 1963-Joseph Brobst
41. Stack's, April 10, 11, 12, 1969-R.L. Miles collection Part II, lot #34
42. Stack's, March 15, 1975- The Dr. David L. Spence collection of U.S. Colonial Coins and an Important Collection of U.S. Half Cents, lot #844
43. Taxay, Don-Counterfeit, Misstruck and Unofficial US Coins (1963)
44. Thomas, Moses & Sons, November 1878, catalogued by Ebenezer Mason, lot #912
45. Woodward, W. Eliot, Fifth Semi Annual Sale, October 18, 1864, W. Eliot Woodward's Collection of American and Foreign Coins and Medals, lot #761
46. Yeoman, R.S.-A Guidebook of US Coins (1989)